REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY COMMITTEE

Legislative Services Agency
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789
Tel: (317) 233-0696 Fax: (317) 232-2554

MEETING MINUTES[1]

Meeting Date:	**August 14, 2007**
Meeting Time:	**9:00 A.M.**
Meeting Place:	**State House, 200 W. Washington St., House Chambers**
Meeting City:	**Indianapolis, Indiana**
Meeting Number:	**1**

Members Present: **Sen. Brandt Hershman, Co-Chairperson; Sen. Ryan Mishler; Sen. Beverly Gard; Sen. Ed Charbonneau; Sen. Dennis Kruse; Sen. Sue Landske; Sen. James Merritt; Sen. Sue Errington; Sen. Jean Breaux; Sen. Earline Rogers; Rep. David Crooks, Co-Chairperson; Rep. Jerry Denbo; Rep. Ryan Dvorak; Rep. Dan Stevenson; Rep. Jack Lutz; Rep. Robert Behning; Rep. David Frizzell; Rep. Ed Soliday.**

Members Absent: **Sen. Karen Tallian; Rep. Kreg Battles; Rep. Chester Dobis; Rep. Timothy Neese; Rep. Paul Robertson.**

Representative David Crooks and Senator Brandt Hershman, Co-Chairmen of the

[1] Exhibits and other materials referenced in these minutes can be inspected and copied in the Legislative Information Center in Room 230 of the State House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Requests for copies may be mailed to the Legislative Information Center, Legislative Services Agency, 200 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2789. A fee of $0.15 per page and mailing costs will be charged for copies. These minutes are also available on the Internet at the General Assembly homepage. The URL address of the General Assembly homepage is http://www.in.gov/legislative/. No fee is charged for viewing, downloading, or printing minutes from the Internet.

Regulatory Flexibility Committee, convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. Representative Crooks announced that the meeting's agenda would include a discussion of energy efficiency and renewable energy efforts in Indiana.

(**1) Indiana Coalition for Renewable Energy and Economic Development:**

Low-carbon energy policy:

Representative Crooks invited Paul Chase to speak on behalf of the Indiana Coalition for Renewable Energy and Economic Development (ICREED). Mr. Chase explained that ICREED was formed in January 2006 as a coalition of various interests dedicated to improving Indiana's economy through renewable energy and distributed generation technologies. He then announced that he would present the "business case" for adopting a low-carbon energy policy in Indiana.[2]

Mr. Chase explained that a low-carbon policy would include state legislation that promotes the generation and use of electricity that will result in little or no carbon dioxide emissions. Such a policy could include incentives for energy efficiency measures and for generation from renewable sources, such as wind and biomass.

Mr. Chase argued that it is crucial for Indiana to adopt low-carbon policies now, in light of pending federal legislation to regulate carbon emissions. As an example, he pointed to a bill proposed by Senators John Warner (R-VA) and Joe Lieberman (D-CT) that would require a 70% reduction in carbon emissions from 2005 levels by 2050. Given that 95% of the Indiana's electricity is generated from high carbon fuels, the state should be especially concerned about future federal carbon regulations, according to Mr. Chase.

Mr. Chase further warned that electricity rates could increase significantly if Indiana does not aggressively pursue commercially established low-carbon technologies. He noted that there are no commercially feasible technologies to capture and store carbon emissions at conventional coal-burning electric plants. Mr. Chase also disputed that integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) plants, such as the one planned by Duke Energy at Edwardsport, would be able to comply with carbon standards in a more cost effective manner. Rather, the federal Energy Information Administration (EIA) predicted in 2006 that retrofitting an IGCC plant would have a 30% higher capital cost than retrofitting a conventional coal-fired plant.

Mr. Chase then highlighted several technologies and policies that could be part of a low-carbon policy for Indiana. First, he described both the energy-generating and economic-development opportunities presented by wind power. He noted that Indiana currently has 330 MW of wind power in development, with a potential to generate up to 40,000 MW of wind power, according to a January 2006 study by the United States Department of Energy. Mr. Chase further testified that each wind turbine constructed in Indiana creates jobs, results in tax revenues for counties, and provides $4,000 to $9,000 in income for landowners who agree to locate the turbines on their property.

Mr. Chase also discussed the potential of biomass and solar power as sources of energy for Indiana. He explained that biomass technologies transform various forms of waste into energy and useful products. Available throughout the state, biomass includes such sources as landfill gas, manure, and crop and forest residues. Mr. Chase reported that Indiana has 6 MW of installed biomass generation capacity.

---

[2]See Exhibit 1.

While not as viable as biomass as a source of power statewide, solar energy has the potential to generate both electricity and jobs in southern Indiana. Mr. Chase noted that a significant advantage of solar systems is their ability to generate more power during the summer months, when the demand for electricity is at a peak due to increased air conditioning use. According to Mr. Chase, Indiana has 22 kW of installed solar capacity.

Despite the opportunities that exist to develop various renewable energy resources in the state, Mr. Chase reported that Indiana lags behind other Midwestern states in establishing a strong market for renewables. He argued that in order to encourage developers to make investments in renewable energy products in Indiana, legislators should adopt a renewable energy standard (RES), which would require electric utilities to provide a certain percentage of their power from renewable sources by a specified date. He noted that several nearby states have adopted an RES, including Illinois (25% by 2025), Wisconsin (10% by 2015), and Minnesota (25% by 2025).

In addition to encouraging the use of renewables in Indiana, Mr. Chase urged policymakers to incorporate energy efficiency measures in a low-carbon policy for the state. He explained that demand for energy in the state can be reduced by improving the energy efficiency of appliances, commercial and residential buildings, and industrial processes. He reported that in 2007, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy ranked Indiana 41st among the states in terms of its energy efficiency policies, with the state scoring only five out of 44 possible points among the measures used in the rankings. Mr. Chase then recommended the following strategies to improve Indiana's energy efficiency standing among the states: (1) increased spending by utilities on rebates and loans for customers who undertake energy efficiency measures; (2) the adoption of building codes that include energy efficiency standards; and (3) the adoption of state efficiency standards for appliances. He maintained that with its strong manufacturing base, Indiana could become a national leader in developing and producing energy efficient technologies and appliances.

Energy efficient buildings:

Mr. Chase then introduced William Brown, Associate Partner at Browning Day Mullins Dierdorf Architects, to discuss energy efficient buildings.[3] Mr. Brown reported that buildings account for 70% of electricity use in the United States. Given this statistic, Mr. Brown argued that it has become crucial to design and construct energy efficient buildings in order to reduce the nation's electricity consumption. He then described the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system, which has been developed by the U.S. Green Building Council to certify buildings that meet certain benchmarks for efficiency in design, construction, and operation. Mr. Brown reported that LEED certified buildings on average save 30% more energy than buildings constructed in compliance with minimum building code requirements. While these "green" buildings cost 1.8% more to build, the initial investment is usually recouped within three years through energy savings, providing an average return on investment of 25% to 40%.

Mr. Brown announced that there are 50 registered green building projects in Indiana. Six of these projects are certified LEED projects, including two public libraries. He pointed to Purdue University and Indiana University as examples of two additional public institutions that are pursuing energy efficiency measures, explaining that the universities are measuring their "carbon footprints," with the goal of eventually achieving carbon neutrality in all of their buildings. Mr. Brown reported that green building initiatives are also underway

[3]See Exhibit 2.

in the private sector, including a 2.5 million square foot mixed-use development planned for Indianapolis. According to Mr. Brown, the developers are seeking the highest level LEED "Platinum" certification and are anticipating power savings of 25% per year over traditional buildings.

Having highlighted several green building projects in Indiana, Mr. Brown concluded by urging legislators to encourage more of these projects by offering incentives to utilities that provide rebates or grants to customers who install energy efficiency systems. He also recommended that incentives be provided to building owners and developers to encourage the modification and construction of buildings that consume less energy.

Net metering:

Following Mr. Brown's testimony, the Committee heard from Jesse Kharbanda, Policy Advocate for the Environmental Law & Policy Center. Speaking as a representative of ICREED, Mr. Kharbanda offered testimony on behalf of Gary West, Sales Manager for Indiana Tool and Manufacturing Company (ITAMCO) in Plymouth, Indiana.[4] Mr. Kharbanda explained that ITAMCO manufactures precision gears and machine components for off-highway vehicles and mining equipment, as well as for use by the aerospace and wind power industries. As a large consumer of electricity, ITAMCO is seeking to install 2 MW of wind-powered generating equipment at its two manufacturing sites in Marshall County. In order for this installation to be economically viable, ITAMCO would need to participate in a net metering program with its local electric utility, whereby it could return any excess electricity generated back to the power grid and receive a credit on its electric bill. However, Indiana's net metering rule applies only to facilities with a generating capacity of 10 kW or less. To enable ITAMCO and other manufacturers to take advantage of the energy savings afforded by net metering, Mr. Kharbanda urged policymakers to amend Indiana's net metering rule to allow participation by facilities with a 2MW generating capacity. Mr. Kharbanda argued that Indiana's capacity restrictions for net metering put enterprising businesses such as ITAMCO at a competitive disadvantage, noting that other states allow larger on-site generating facilities to participate in net metering.

Renewable energy investments in Indiana:

Mr. Kharbanda then offered testimony on behalf of John Doster II, Business Development Manager for Invenergy LLC.[5] Mr. Kharbanda explained that Invenergy LLC is headquartered in Chicago and is a developer of large-scale wind-energy and thermal generating facilities. Mr. Kharbanda reported that Invenergy is actively developing several wind projects in Indiana. These projects will provide revenue to local governments in the form of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes (PILOTS), as well as annual payments to landowners. While Invenergy would like to develop more wind projects in Indiana, there is little incentive for it to do so in the absence of a strong state policy supporting renewable sources of electricity. Rather, Invenergy is more likely to locate its future projects in one of the neighboring states that has adopted an RES. By adopting an RES, Indiana policymakers would encourage developers to invest in renewable projects in Indiana, which in turn would attract supplemental services and manufacturing operations.

---

[4]See Exhibit 3.

[5]See Exhibit 4.

Mr. Kharbanda then introduced Bill Keith, President of SunRise Solar, Inc.[6] Mr. Keith explained that his company is headquartered in St. John, Indiana, and has a manufacturing facility in Warsaw, Indiana, where it produces solar-powered attic fans. These fans operate on hot days—during peak times of electricity consumption—by pulling hot air from attic spaces and thereby reducing the load on a building's air conditioning unit. Mr. Keith reported that consumers can save 30% in energy costs by installing a SunRise attic fan. With demand for these fans increasing, SunRise has already sold out of the product three times in 2007. However, he noted that demand for his products is highest in states that offer incentives for the installation of energy efficient systems. For example, in Hawaii, which offers a 35% tax credit for such installations, SunRise Solar supplied solar panels for the Honolulu airport. Mr. Keith urged legislators to adopt similar tax incentives for purchasers in Indiana. He advocated additional incentives for manufacturers such as SunRise, so that Indiana companies can invest more of their income in research and development.

Public health effects of coal-fired electric utilities:

Following Mr. Keith's testimony, Dr. Stephan Jay addressed the Committee.[7] A pulmonologist and former chair of the Department of Public Health at the Indiana University School of Medicine, Dr. Jay testified about the adverse effects of coal-powered electric utilities on public health. Dr. Jay attributed Indiana's ranking among the top five polluting states in the country to the state's reliance on coal-fired power plants.

According to Dr. Jay, the pollutants produced by coal-fired plants have contributed to the high rates of cardiovascular and respiratory disease among Indiana residents. He reported that research he conducted with Dr. Greg Steele, former State Epidemiologist, indicated that fine particulate pollution alone results in over $5 billion in economic costs, including health care costs and lost productivity, each year in Indiana. Noting that only 10% of federal funding for coal-related research and development is devoted to health and environmental research, he suggested that more resources need to be allocated to exploring pollution reduction technologies and promoting renewable energy sources.

Discussion and questions by the Committee:

Jesse Kharbanda concluded ICREED's presentation by again encouraging legislators to pursue a low-carbon policy to advance the interests of Indiana businesses and potentially save ratepayers money. He commended the participation of utilities in the National Action Plan on Energy Efficiency and their commitment to purchasing blocks of wind power as part of their energy portfolios. However, he cautioned that statewide policies need to be adopted in order for Indiana to realize the significant benefits that renewable energy projects and energy efficiency measures can provide.

Representative Crooks then invited Committee members to pose questions to any of the speakers who testified on behalf of ICREED. At this invitation, Representative Lutz asked Bill Keith from SunRise Solar whether he thought that mandates or incentives would be more effective in encouraging investment in energy efficiency systems, such as those produced by Mr. Keith's company. Mr. Keith responded that he thought both types of policies would be effective. For example, legislators could offer incentives in the form of sales tax exemptions for the purchase of energy efficient products, while mandating that

---

[6]See Exhibit 5.

[7]See Exhibit 6.

newly constructed homes meet certain energy efficiency standards.

Representative Crooks then asked Mr. Kharbanda whether he had any predictions as to when Congress would enact any energy-related legislation. Mr. Kharbanda indicated that the U.S. House of Representatives recently passed a bill that included a nationwide RES, requiring utilities to provide 15% of their power from renewable sources by 2020, while allowing up to 4% of that requirement to be satisfied through energy efficiency measures. However, Mr. Kharbanda noted that the House-passed energy legislation differs significantly from that passed by the U.S. Senate, making it likely that the differences will have to be resolved in a conference committee.

(2) Industry and Government Perspectives:

Industry perspective:

Turning next to the electric industry's perspective on energy efficiency and renewable energy measures, Representive Crooks asked for comments from Diane Munns, Executive Director of Edison Electric Institute's (EEI) Retail Energy Services Group. Ms. Munns explained that in addition to her work for the EEI, an association of investor owned utilities, she also has worked as a state regulator, having served as a commissioner of the Iowa Utilities Board. Ms. Munn reported that her insight into the perspectives of both regulators and the utilities they regulate has led her to two conclusions: (1) that utilities must be accountable for their use of resources and their impact on the environment; and (2) that it is equally as important, for both utilities and the ratepayers they serve, that utilities remain financially sound as they pursue energy efficiency and renewable energy measures.

First, Ms. Munns noted that energy efficiency measures are necessitated by the world's rising demand for electricity. In recent years, people in the United States have been building larger homes, which require more energy to heat and cool, and have been purchasing more consumer electronics. Ms. Munns reported that the average American home has 26 electronic appliances that are always plugged in and therefore "always on," such as refrigerators, video players, and battery chargers. Plasma televisions and other new products require more electricity to operate than earlier models.

The need for energy conservation is also driven by rising costs for fuels, including natural gas and oil, as well as for building materials, such as copper, steel, and concrete. Ms. Munns noted that these higher prices make it cost prohibitive for utilities to construct new plants. She attributed the rising prices to increased energy demand and building projects in India and China.

Having acknowledged the need for energy efficiency and conservation measures, Ms. Munns highlighted three common approaches for implementing such measures: (1) mandates; (2) alternative pricing structures; and (3) utility-sponsored programs, products, and services.

First, Ms. Munn pointed to building codes and appliance efficiency standards as two ways to achieve efficiency through governmental mandates. She reported that codes requiring buildings to meet certain energy efficiency standards have been adopted in California. While these codes do increase building costs in the short term, they have resulted in energy cost savings over the long term. California has also adopted energy efficiency standards for certain consumer products, such as refrigerators and clothes washers, similar to those adopted under the federal Energy Star program. Because of its significant influence on American energy consumption due to its large population, California's

appliance standards have the potential to achieve a significant reduction in the nation's energy use. However, Ms. Munns suggested that less populated states may not be able to achieve any notable reduction by adopting similar standards.

Next, Ms. Munns described alternative pricing structures as an effective way to encourage conservation by making consumers aware of the true price of energy consumption. She discussed natural gas "decoupling," an alternative mechanism for determining the rates charged by gas utilities, in which the price charged to the customer is separated, or "decoupled" from the amount of gas consumed by the customer. Ms. Munns explained that this concept differs from the traditional utility rate design, in which utilities make money based on the volume of gas sold. Under the traditional design, in which utilities earn more when customers consume more, utilities have no incentive to encourage customers to conserve. Decoupling does not provide incentives for utilities if customers' usage decreases; rather, it works to level out increases or decreases in the distribution charge collected by a utility over a period of time. For example, if a utility experiences a revenue shortfall one year due to reduced consumer usage, it is made whole for its loss during the following year through the allowance of an increased distribution charge. Under a decoupling structure, the utility ultimately collects no more or no less revenue than was originally approved in its rate case.

With respect to electric utilities, Ms. Munns described "time of use" pricing models, in which customers are charged higher rates for electricity used during peak consumption periods. She noted that when consumers are charged a flat rate for electricity regardless of the time of day, they have no incentive to tailor their usage to correspond with non-peak periods in order to reduce the overall demand on the system. Under time-of-use pricing, a customer who waits to run a clothes washer until late at night, when demand is lower, would pay a lower rate for the electricity consumed than a customer who operates an appliance during the middle of the day, when demand is higher.

Finally, Ms. Munns discussed programs, products, and services that utilities can offer to customers to encourage energy conservation and efficiency. She noted that some utilities provide rebates or credits for customers who install energy efficient heating and cooling systems. Others conduct energy audits, educational campaigns, and weatherization programs.

After Ms. Munns had concluded her remarks, Senator Hershman noted that during the 2007 session, the General Assembly had considered legislation to establish an RES for Indiana. He pointed out that the discussion had focused on both the appropriate proportion of renewables within a utility's overall energy portfolio, along with the appropriate mix of resources and technologies that would qualify as renewable resources. He then asked for Ms. Munn's opinions on which states have achieved appropriate benchmarks in establishing an RES, and on the effect of a potential national RES on state-imposed standards. Ms. Munn noted that of the 25 states that have enacted an RES, most have consistent wind or solar resources that make achieving the specified standard feasible. However, states without significant wind or solar resources, including many Southeastern states, have opposed a national RES, fearing that they would be forced to purchase renewable energy credits from other states. Ms. Munn indicated that while the utilities that her organization represents have agreed to meet the requirements of a national RES, they have cautioned that such compliance will impose additional costs that will ultimately be borne by consumers.

Representative Crooks then asked Ed Simcox of the Indiana Energy Association (IEA) to further comment on the industry's perspective on energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives. Mr. Simcox stressed that the IEA's member utilities are not opposed to the use

and development of renewable resources. Rather, from the industry's perspective, renewable resources should be part of a larger host of approaches to meeting energy demand in an environmentally responsible way. In determining how to appropriately incorporate renewables into their energy portfolios, utilities must consider the both the cost and availability of such resources. Mr. Simcox explained that the availability of resources influences their cost. For example, he noted that it costs 8¢ per kWh to generate electricity from wind, which is not consistently available in Indiana, versus 3.5¢ per kWh to generate electricity from coal, which is readily available.

Mr. Simcox then pointed to a chart ranking each state according to its average price of electricity.[8] He noted that among the top ten highest cost states, eight have enacted an RES. He also pointed to Indiana's relatively low electricity prices, with the state ranking 42nd (with a ranking of 50th representing the lowest prices) among all states.

Mr. Simcox then described the efforts of several Indiana utilities to incorporate renewables into their energy portfolios, such as Duke Energy's commitment to purchase 100 MW of electricity from the proposed Benton County Wind Farm. Similarly, Indiana Michigan Power has signed a 20-year power purchase agreement to buy 100 MW of wind energy from the Fowler Ridge Wind Farm in Benton County.

Returning to the issue of a potential state or national RES, Mr. Simcox emphasized that the states that have adopted an RES are those states that have significant wind resources. Noting that Mr. Chase had mentioned Minnesota's adoption of an RES, Mr. Simcox pointed out that Minnesota has a much greater wind capacity than does Indiana, due largely to the former's flat topography and location among the Great Plains states.

Mr. Simcox also reported that both business and labor interests have opposed the adoption of a national RES, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United Mine Workers of America, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Mr. Simcox suggested that this opposition represents a recognition of the potential economic consequences of a national RES. Because businesses consider the cost of electricity when deciding whether to locate in a particular state, those states in which it is more costly to obtain renewable sources of energy would experience an increase in electric rates under an RES, thereby limiting their ability to attract new businesses.

Finally, Mr. Simcox stressed that because of its lack of significant wind and solar energy resources, Indiana must continue to invest in clean coal technologies. He reminded legislators that the final version of HB 1824 (2007) had defined clean coal projects and demand side management (DSM) programs as "renewable energy resources" for purposes of a state RES, indicating a recognition by Representative Grubb of the reality of Indiana's energy resources.

Government perspective:

Following remarks by the industry, Representative Crooks invited comments from the government sector by asking Brandon Seitz to address the Committee. As Manager of Energy for the state's Office of Energy and Defense Development (OED),[9] Mr. Seitz gave a brief overview of the OED's functions and funding sources. He then described the

---

[8]See Exhibit 7.

[9]See Exhibit 8.

various state tax credits for alternative energy production, including the new credit for cellulosic ethanol production. Beginning in 2008, the state will provide up to $20,000,000 in credits for taxpayers who produce at least 20,000,000 gallons of cellulosic ethanol in a taxable year. According to Mr. Seitz, Indiana and Kansas are the only two states that provide credits for cellulosic ethanol production.

Additionally, the tax credit for investments in integrated coal gasification plants was expanded in 2007 to include facilities producing synthetic natural gas. Under another change to this credit, a developer of a coal gasification facility will be allowed to assign part or all of the developer's tax credit to a utility that enters into an agreement to purchase electricity or substitute natural gas from the facility. Mr. Seitz explained that the part of the tax credit that is assigned to a utility must be taken over a period of 20 years.

In addition to providing incentives to alternative energy producers, the 2007 General Assembly also provided tax credits to consumers through the Energy Savings Tax Credit. Beginning in 2009, this tax credit will be available to individuals or small businesses that invest in Energy Star heating and cooling equipment. A taxpayer will be entitled to a credit equal to the lesser of $100 or 20% of the amount of the investment made.

After describing these recently enacted or expanded tax credits, Mr. Seitz discussed several programs administered by the OED, including the Alternative Power and Energy Grant Program, which has funded 22 alternative energy projects from 2005-2007. Mr. Seitz explained that the grants have funded both commercial and demonstration projects involving a diverse range of technologies, including coal mine methane recovery, biomass, wind power, solar energy, and geothermal heat pumps. He reported that over $1.2 million has been awarded under the program, which in turn has leveraged $35 million in private investment.

The OED also administers programs to promote biofuels, including the Biofuels Grant Program, which provides grants for the installation of E85 (ethanol) and B20 (biodiesel) fuel pumps throughout the state. The OED is also participating in the I-65 Biofuels Corridor Project, which is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and involves installing 31 new E85 pumps and five new B20 pumps along I-65 from Gary, Indiana, to Mobile, Alabama.

After describing a number of OED-sponsored energy projects in Marion County, Mr. Seitz turned the discussion over to Ryan Brown, Alternative Energy Specialist for the OED. Mr. Brown outlined several new energy programs for the state's 2008 fiscal year, including the Biomass Feasibility Study Grant Program. Mr. Brown explained that this program will provide $100,000 for feasibility studies for biomass-to-energy projects, such as anaerobic digesters. Targeted to the agricultural sector, the studies will serve as a foundation for future funding under the federal farm bill.

Additionally, the Alternative Power and Energy Grant Program will make $300,000 available for demonstration projects involving small wind facilities, photovoltaics, and solar water heating technologies. Beginning October 1, 2007, the new Alternative Power and Energy Residential Rebate Program will make $500,000 available to homeowners who install geothermal heat pumps.

Mr. Brown next turned to wind power development in Indiana. He reported that in 2005, the OED and the U.S. DOE completed a "tall towers" study, which involved collecting data from five different wind towers that were constructed at higher heights and located throughout the state. The study indicated that several Indiana counties in the northern half of Indiana have the potential to sustain utility-scale wind farms. According to Mr.

Brown, Indiana's potential wind power capacity is 40,000 MW, based on currently available technology.

Mr. Brown then highlighted two Indiana wind farm developments. Construction on the 130 MW Benton County Wind Farm began in July 2007 and is expected to be completed in May 2008. Mr. Brown reported that both Duke Energy and Vectren plan to purchase power from the plant once it is online. Construction on the 200 MW Fowler Ridge Wind Farm is set to begin in 2008 and finish within the year. As noted by Mr. Simcox, Indiana Michigan Power plans to purchase power from this facility.

Mr. Brown concluded his testimony by describing wind power initiatives undertaken by several municipalities and municipally owned utilities, including the City of Carmel and Richmond Power & Light.

There being no further business before the Committee, the Co-Chairmen adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.